REMARKS

Claims 1-9 currently remain in the application. Claims 1 and 4 are herein amended, and claims 8 and 9 are newly added claims.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Cohen, claims 3 and 7 being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Cohen in view of Shinohara. In view of the Examiner's reasons for rejection in Paragraph 2 of the Official Letter, applicant has herein amended independent claims 1 and 4 to include therein a detailed definition of "direction of edge pixel" according to the definition that was already present in the specification (in page 2 at lines 24-26). New claims 8 and 9 are herein added to address to particular situations where the specified angle mentioned in amended claims 1 and 4 is 90°. This particular situation is also described in the specification and hence these new claims are believed to be enterable. The Examiner's suggestion/recommendation regarding inclusion of the formulas in page 7 of the specification is noted but applicant does not believe that the invention should be limited so narrowly and hence declines to comply.

With the direction of each edge pixel thus more narrowly defined, it is believed that the set of claims now presented is believed to obviate the Examiner's rejection, and it is earnestly solicited that the Examiner agree and allow the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 29,093

December 8, 2005 BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP 500 12th Street, Suite 200 Oakland, California 94607

Telephone: (510) 663-1100

Telefax: (510) 663-0920